

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-19 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1, 5-6, 8-10, 13-14 and 16-17 are amended. Various amendments are made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 because the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth below; (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and/or (3) place the application in better form for appeal should an appeal be necessary. More specifically, independent claim 1 is amended to include features of dependent claim 8. Independent claim 14 is amended to include other features of dependent claim 8. All other claim amendments are merely for clarity. Thus, no new issues are raised. Entry is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

The Office Action rejects claims 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 7,003,790 to Inoue et al. (hereafter Inoue). The Office Action also rejects claims 1, 3-7 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Inoue in view of U.S. Patent 5,416,693 to Yoshinari. The Office Action also rejects claims 8, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Inoue in view of Yoshinari and U.S. Patent 6,184,918 to Goldshmidt Iki et al. (hereafter Goldshmidt Iki). Still further, the Office Action rejects claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Inoue, Yoshinari and Goldshmidt Iki and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,006,881 to Hoffberg et al. (hereafter Hoffberg). The Office Action also rejects claims 18 and 19 and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Inoue. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites that a user history recorder includes a consumption behavior recorder for recording a consumption behavior of each section according to the user's action on each section while using a content. Independent claim 1 also recites that the consumption behavior recorder comprises: a normal finish record area for recording whether the user has viewed a content to an end at a normal speed, a skimmed record area for recording a section information when a skimmed action is made on the content, and a skipped record area for recording a section information when a skipped action is made on the content.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least the features of independent claim 1. More specifically, when discussing features of previous dependent claim 8, the Office Action assert that Inoue's col. 17, lines 57-62 corresponds to the claimed skimmed record area, Inoue's col. 17, lines 57-62 corresponds to the claimed skipped record area and Yoshinari's col. 4, lines 6-7 correspond to the claimed normal finish area. Applicant respectfully disagrees with these assertions.

More specifically, Inoue's col. 17, lines 57-62 states that when a user watches an EPG, that the commercial or broadcast program is not watched by a user so that the audience rating be corrected. However, this does not correspond to a skimmed action being made on the content. Rather, this merely shows an EPG is viewed rather than a commercial or broadcasting program. Accordingly, Inoue's col. 17, lines 57-62 does not correspond to the claimed skimmed record area for recording a section information when a skimmed action is made on the content.

Furthermore, Inoue's col. 17, lines 57-62 does not teach or suggest that a skipped action is made on the content. Rather, the cited section merely shows a EPG can be viewed rather than a commercial or broadcast program and that the audience rating may be corrected. Accordingly, Inoue's col. 17, lines 57-62 does not correspond to the claimed skipped record area for recording a section information when a skipped action is made on the content.

For at least the reasons as set forth above, Inoue and the other applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 14 recites storing, at the interactive television, consumption behavior record information including information on a user's action on a specific content and information on a relevant content in the user history recorder, and transferring by the interactive television, the consumption behavior record information stored in the user history recorder to the content provider every designated cycle. Independent claim 14 also recites that the consumption behavior record information includes: information related to a rewinding action made by a user on the content, information related to a slowing action made by the user on the content, and information related to a stopped action made by the user on the content.

Inoue and the other applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 14. More specifically, the Office Action (on page 18) asserts that Yoshinari's col. 3, lines 53-63, col. 4, lines 2-6 and 17-20 and steps 24, 25 and 27 of Figure 2 correspond to the claimed slow recording area, and Yoshinari's col. 3, lines 53-63 and col. 4, lines 5-6 and 17-

Reply to Office Action dated December 13, 2006

20 and steps 24, 25 and 27 of Figure 2 correspond to the claimed at least one stop record area. However, the cited sections of Yoshinari do not suggest consumption behavior record information that includes information related to a slowing action made by the user on the content, and information related to a stopped action made by the user on the content.

Still further, the Office Action (on page 17) asserts that Inoue's col. 17, lines 38-47 corresponds to the claimed rewind action. Inoue's col. 17, lines 38-47 relates to a program that is recorded by a VTR. If this occurs, then the totalization center 8 may recognize that the program may be watched repeatedly because it is being recorded on a VTR. However, merely because the user records a program, this does not suggest that a rewinding action is being made on the content. Accordingly, Inoue's col. 17, lines 38-47 does not correspond to the claimed information related to a rewinding action made by a user on the content.

Accordingly, Inoue and Yoshinari do not suggest the features of independent claim 14 as alleged in the Office Action. The other applied references do not teach or suggest the missing features. Thus, independent claim 14 defines patentable subject matter.

Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1 and 3-19 are earnestly

Serial No. **10/025,920**

Docket No. **K-0373**

Reply to Office Action dated December 13, 2006

solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3777 DCO/kah

Date: March 13, 2007

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610